3639

46)		us				PTO/SB/21 (09-04) through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 J.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995	, no persons	s are required to respond to a c Application Number	ollection of inf	ormation	unless it	displays a valid OMB control number.	
TRANSMITTAL FORM		Filing Date		November 7, 2001			
		First Named Inventor	David P. Vellante				
		Art Unit	3639				
		Examiner Name		laha			
(to be used for all correspondence after initial	filing)	Attorney Docket Number	Fadey S. J	abr			
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Altomey Docket Number	ITC 2-002					
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)							
Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached  Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s)  Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement  Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	Drawing(s)  Licensing-related Papers  Petition  Petition to Convert to a  Provisional Application  Power of Attorney, Revocati  Change of Correspondence  Ferminal Disclaimer  Request for Refund  CD, Number of CD(s)  Landscape Table on C  ks  te to Restriction Requirement	Address		Appea of App Appea (Appea Proprie	Allowance Communication to TC  Il Communication to Board leals and Interferences  Il Communication to TC Il Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) letary Information  Letter  Enclosure(s) (please Identify):	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm Name Mueller and Smith, LPA							
Signature Dione F. Benhe							
Printed name Diane E. Burke	ame						
Date October 24, 2005			Reg. No.	45,725	5		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is the sufficient postage as first class mail in an entitle date shown below:	peing facsir	CATE OF TRANSMISS mile transmitted to the USP dressed to: Commissioner for	TO or depos	ited with	n the Un	ited States Postal Service with Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on	
7 0	7/	eney					
Typed or printed name Sane Keeney	1)-0	iney			Date	October 24, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Appln. No. 10/053,304 Response dated October 24, 2005 Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Ye Application of

David P. Vellante, et al.

Serial No.

10/053,304

Filed:

OCT 2 7 2005

November 7, 2001

For:

Method for Assessing the Business Value of Information

Technology

TC/AU

3639

Examiner

Fadey S. Jabr

Attorney Docket No.

ITC 2-002

HONORABLE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS MAIL STOP AMENDMENT P.O. BOX 1450 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

This is a response to the October 17, 2005 Office Action containing a restriction requirement.

It is noted that the restriction has been called for with respect to two inventions identified as Inventions I and II. Invention I includes claims 1-14 and 27-30, while Invention II includes claims 15-26. Applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, Invention I including claims 1-14 and 27-30.

Section 121 of the Patent Statute authorizes a requirement for restriction only when two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. The two inventions identified above clearly are dependent in that each is related to the other in operation or effect. The Statute requires both independence and distinctness, not either, and provides such requirement in definite terms. The construction adopted by the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure assumes that the Statute authorizes restriction between inventions which are not independent and distinct, but which are either independent or distinct. It is Applicant's position that the plain meaning of the Statute defies such construction. For this reason, Applicant requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn so that the claims in controversy may be prosecuted as a single invention.

Appln. No. 10/053,304 Response dated October 24, 2005 Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 00, 24, 2005

Diane E. Burke Reg. No. 45,725

MUELLER AND SMITH, L.P.A. Mueller-Smith Building 7700 Rivers Edge Drive Columbus, Ohio 43235-1355

Tel.: 614-436-0600 Fax: 614-436-0057

email: dburke@muellersmith.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on October 24, 2005 with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450